



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,741	05/01/2001	Jai Rawat	CA1095	4472
23493	7590	09/01/2005	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 401 Castro Street, Ste 220 Mountain View, CA 94041-2007			SHINGLES, KRISTIE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	
DATE MAILED: 09/01/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/846,741

Applicant(s)

RAWAT ET AL.

Examiner

Kristie Shingles

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-18, 23-29, 34 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11, 19-22 and 30-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 12-18, 23-29, 34 and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

PD

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant has amended claims 1-10, 12-18 and 23-29.

Claims 11, 19-22 and 30-33 have been cancelled.

Claims 34 and 35 are new.

Claims 1-10, 12-18, 23-29, 34 and 35 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6, 12 and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 23, 26, 29, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Bowman et al* (USPN 6,460,163).

Art Unit: 2141

a. **Per claim 1**, *Bowman et al* teach a system for capturing electronic receipts, comprising:

- a first computer server receiving electronic correspondence and parsing said electronic correspondence to identify commercial correspondence having commercial data related to a commercial transaction (Figure 4, col.7 lines 18-54; parsing of digital receipt); and
- program code residing on said first computer server for creating receipt data by extracting said commercial data from said electronic correspondence (col.7 lines 38-67, col.8 lines 1-28).

b. **Claim 6** contains limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Per claim 12**, *Bowman et al* teach a system for capturing data from electronic correspondence, comprising:

- a first computer server receiving incoming electronic commerce correspondence to the user (col.7 lines 15-37);
- a central database having data records accessible to said first computer server (col.4 lines 21-34, col.6 lines 8-34 and 55-64, col.7 lines 49-67);
- program code residing on said first computer server for parsing said electronic correspondence to identify data content (col.4 lines 27-33, col.7 lines 38-67, col.8 lines 1-28); and
- additional program code for extracting said data content in accordance with instructions contained in said data records (col.7 line 38-col.8 line 28).

d. **Claim 23** contains limitations substantially equivalent to claim 12 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

e. **Per claim 2**, *Bowman et al* teach the system of Claim 1, wherein said first computer server permits display of receipt data (col.6 line 10-col.7 line 11).

Art Unit: 2141

f. **Claim 13** is substantially similar to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

g. **Per claim 4**, *Bowman et al* teach the system of Claim 3, wherein said program code comprises: instructions for storing said receipt data in said database (col.4 lines 28-34, col.6 lines 8-67).

h. **Per claim 5**, *Bowman et al* teach the system of Claim 4, wherein said first computer server permits extraction of said receipt data from said database (col.6 line 55-col.7 line 11, col.7 line 38-col.8 line 7).

i. **Per claim 9**, *Bowman et al* teach the method of Claim 6, wherein said step of examining comprises the steps of: querying a database of template data; and comparing said electronic correspondence with said template data obtained from said step of querying (col.7 line 42-col.9 line 35).

j. **Claim 26** is substantially similar to claim 9 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

k. **Per claim 10**, *Bowman et al* teach the method of Claim 6, further comprising the steps of providing a database for storing receipt data; and storing identified commercial data as receipt data in said database (col.4 lines 28-34, col.6 lines 8-67, col.7 line 42-col.8 line 28).

l. **Claim 15** is substantially similar to claims 4 and 10 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

m. **Claim 16** is substantially similar to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

n. **Per claim 18**, *Bowman et al* teach the system of Claim 12, wherein said electronic correspondence contains data content related to an electronic receipt (col.6 lines 16-64, col.7 lines 38-54).

o. **Claim 29** is substantially similar to claims 16 and 18 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

p. **Per claim 34**, *Bowman et al* teach the system of Claim 12, wherein said central database is encrypted (col.6 lines 38-44 and 55-64).

q. **Claim 35** is substantially similar to claim 34 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims **3, 7, 8, 14, 17, 24, 25 and 28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bowman et al* (USPN 6,460,163) in view of *Julien* (USPN 6,694,307).

a. **Per claim 3**, *Bowman et al* teach the systems and methods of Claims 1, 6, 12 and 23 as applied above. *Bowman et al* teach the system of Claim 1 comprising a database at said first computer server (col.6 lines 55-59), yet fail to explicitly teach the system of Claim 1, wherein said first computer server permits alteration of header data of said electronic

Art Unit: 2141

correspondence in accordance with data records stored in said database. However, *Julien* discloses a system allowing a server to access a database and furthermore permits alteration and updates of electronic correspondence header data, which primarily includes address data—i.e. email addresses, fax numbers, postal addresses, etc (col.3 lines 1-62, col.7 lines 20-29, col.9 line 65-col.11 line 17 and col.11 line 21-col.12 line 28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Bowman et al* and *Julien* in order to allow for alteration of header data in electronic correspondence for the purpose of keeping information up-to-date and keeping the database current.

b. **Claims 7, 8, 14, 17, 24, 25 and 28** contain limitations substantially similar to Claim 3 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

6. Claim **27** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bowman et al* (USPN 6,460,163) in view of *Kramer et al* (USPN 6,324,525).

Per claim 27, *Bowman et al* teach the method of claim 23 as applied above, yet fails to distinctly teach the method of claim 23 further comprising: providing an additional database for storing said data content; and storing said data content in said additional database in accordance with instructions contained in said data records. However, *Kramer et al* teach the use of additional databases within the database management system that store data according to types of information adhered to in the data records (col.66 lines 19-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Bowman et al* and *Kramer et al* to allow for an additional

Art Unit: 2141

database for the purpose of distributive storage wherein data content can be allocated to different databases in the network.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: *Philyaw et al* (USPN 6,377,986), *Philyaw* (USPN 6,845,388), *Ankireddipally et al* (USPN 6,772,216) and *Lapsley et al* (USPN 6,879,966).

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00PM.

Art Unit: 2141

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie Shingles
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

kds



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER